IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF OREGON

| LINDSAY K. HUNT, |) | |
|----------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) | Civil Case No. 08-802-AC |
| vs. |) | ORDER |
| CITY OF PORTLAND, an Oregon |) | |
| Municipal Corporation, WILLIAM |) | |
| HUBNER, an individual; JOSEPH |) | |
| SCHILLING, an individual; ERIC |) | |
| HENDRICKS, an individual; BRYAN |) | |
| PARMAN, an individual; JUDY |) | |
| BRUMFIELD, an individual; LESLIE |) | |
| PINTARICH, an individual; and |) | |
| QUENCY HO, an individual, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| | _) | |

Dennis Steinman Matthew C. Ellis 520 SW Yamhill Street, Suite 600 Portland, Oregon 97201

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Jennifer M. Johnston City Attorney's Office 1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 430 Portland, Oregon 97204

Attorney for Defendant

KING, Judge:

The Honorable John V. Acosta, United States Magistrate Judge, filed a Findings and Recommendation on November 19, 2008. The matter is before this court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). No objections have been timely filed. This relieves me of my obligation to give the factual findings de novo review. Lorin Corp. v. Goto & Co., Ltd., 700 F.2nd 1202, 1206 (8th Cir. 1983); See also Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Having reviewed the legal principles de novo, I find no error.

Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Acosta's Findings and Recommendation (#33). IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (#26) her Fourth Claim for Relief and to dismiss Ho from her Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth Claims for Relief, without prejudice, is GRANTED. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (#19) is GRANTED with regard to plaintiff's Fifth, Sixth and Tenth Claims for Relief against Pintarich, plaintiff's Tenth Claim for Relief against Ho, and plaintiff's Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Claims for Relief. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is DENIED with regard to plaintiff's First Claim for Relief, Fifth Claim for Relief against Hendricks and Brumfield, and Sixth and Tenth Claims for Relief against Hubner, Schilling, Parman, Hendricks, and Brumfield. Defendants' Motion to Make More Definite and Certain

| (#19) is GRANTED | with regard to plain | ntiff's conspiracy allegation in her Fifth and Sixth Claims |
|---------------------|----------------------|---|
| for Relief and DENI | ED in all other resp | pects. |
| Dated this | 18th | _ day of December, 2008. |
| | | /s/ Garr M. King Garr M. King United States District Judge |